

were to entertain those 45-plus notices over the next couple of days, that would take up probably 24 legislative hours of this body.

This body has been working diligently to try to complete the work of the House so that we can adjourn for this year. As everyone knows, there are three appropriation bills that are contentious. One of those deals with the Census issue which we are told now is about to be worked out. Another dealt with an abortion issue on the Foreign Operations appropriation bill. We are told that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has just about completed a compromise on that, and we are told that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], in negotiations with the House, has just about completed a compromise on the testing.

So that the only issues really to come before this body between now and the time that we would adjourn would be those three appropriation bills, the fast track bill, whether my colleagues are for or against it, I happen to be opposed to it, and some other measures such as these nine United States-China relation bills that are terribly important on the floor, now that it is going to take about 14 or 15 hours.

My point is, we have been delayed now so that we will not be able to complete the day's work on these China bills even if we stay until midnight, which we are, incidentally. We are going to stay at least until midnight. But even then, we will have to carry over five or six of these China bills until tomorrow, and then that just delays any chance that we might have had, I think, of adjourning for the year this Saturday, and even perhaps this Sunday.

But that part is irrelevant. The part that concerns me is that in all of the notices that have been brought before the House, I believe, and I say this sincerely, with no animosity, and I will not yield until I am finished, but I will be glad to at some point, I just believe, I sincerely believe, that they are deleterious in nature, and I have discussed this with the Speaker of the House and asked him if he would not declare them deleterious, keeping in mind that if one or two wanted to be offered each day, certainly knowing the sincerity by some Members of the other side of the aisle that we ought to, as my colleagues know, go along with that. But the Speaker is hesitant to do that because he wants to keep comity in the House.

But, nevertheless, it is the responsibility of the Committee on Rules to see to it that we complete our work on this session, and that is why I have scheduled a Committee on Rules meeting, and I would make notice to the members of the Committee on Rules that we will be considering in the Committee on Rules a two-thirds waiver for remaining appropriation bills from now until Sunday, which means that if the appropriation bills were complete, we could bring them up in the same day.

This is, and when I finish I will yield, this is typical of nomenclature that we do each year. We would also include in that rule permission for suspension days to be brought up with notice to the minority any day between now and Sunday so that we could take care of those significant issues that were not controversial and perhaps deal with them between now and Sunday.

But, also, I am just going to reluctantly recommend to the leadership that we limit in some way the notices that Members can bring on questions of privilege. Perhaps, and I have not decided how we will do this, but perhaps giving that right to the minority leader and the majority leader so that we can have negotiations that try to work out some comity and complete the work of the House. It is terribly important for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I support what he is trying to do for the simple reason that I have heard the notices read over and over again protesting the fact that we do not have a result yet in the election contest, and I just say to my friends that the notices are written in such a way that they are totally one-sided, there is no time for debate, and I sit there looking at the newspaper headlines in California saying that the secretary of state has found that 60 percent of the registrations by one group of people who were registered and voted manipulated—it says that 60 percent of these registrations were illegal.

And yet the idea, if my colleagues listen to the text of the privileged resolutions, which, in essence, are arguments themselves, they talk about Marine barracks being questioned and nuns being questioned. And of course those may be in the huge universe of tens of thousands of people, but the fact that one group alone was found to have had 60 percent of their registrations being fraudulent, and the idea that this House should not investigate that, and that there is no chance for a debate on these privileged motions, they are simply read over and over again in rote.

□ 1600

They were obviously written in such a way as to make the argument in the resolution itself.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I am not going to yield until I am able to finish my sentence.

That, I think, offers no value to this deliberative body, because there is absolutely no time given on the other side, and it gives the impression to the people out in the countryside that there is not a group that had 60 percent fraudulent registrations, which in fact has been the finding of the secretary of state, which would justify any deliberative body in the world at least the idea that we should go forward and at least have a further investigation until we find all the information.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, first of all, I have to yield to the gentleman from Texas who asked me to yield in the first place, and then, if the gentlewoman would let him speak for her, because we have to get on with the regular order.

Ms. DELAURO. Well, I would like to correct the RECORD in a couple of ways, if I can.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will first yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Would the gentleman from Texas rather I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, that is fine.

Mr. SOLOMON. I just did not want to slight the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. There are two points here. One has to do with our colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD] who, in fact, has introduced two privileged motions, two different dates. Both are different, if the gentleman will check and take a look at the Record.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman explain to us how they are different?

Ms. DELAURO. Let me just finish.

Second, there is nothing, nothing, nothing we would like better on this side of the aisle on this issue than to have the opportunity for debate. Every time one of these, after the notice and the vote comes due, we would love to have a debate. In fact, what happens is that a Member gets up and calls for the motion to be tabled, so in fact, we cannot have a debate.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have already had that debate.

Ms. DELAURO. Allow us the opportunity to have the debate on this.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, regular order. Reclaiming my time, the Gephardt debate amendment, or questions of privileges, has been debated on the floor. I now yield back.

#### REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO SPEAK OUT OF ORDER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized out of order for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we have to continue with regular order.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York spoke out of order for 5 minutes, or longer than that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Objection is heard.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF NINE MEASURES RELATING TO THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 302 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 302

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2358) to provide for improved monitoring of human rights violations in the People's Republic of China. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendments recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill and the amendments printed in part 1-A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designees; (2) the further amendment specified in part 1-B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Gilman or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on H.R. 2232, it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2195) to provide for certain measures to increase monitoring of products of the People's Republic of China that are made with forced labor. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on H.R. 2195, it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 188) urging the executive branch to take action regarding the acquisition by Iran of C-802 cruise missiles. The resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and the preamble, as amended, to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the resolution, as amended, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on H. Res. 188, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 967) to prohibit the use of United States funds to provide for the participation of certain Chinese officials in international conferences, programs, and activities and to provide that certain Chinese officials shall

be ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission to the United States. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendments recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on H.R. 967, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2570) to condemn those officials of the Chinese Communist Party, the Government of the People's Republic of China, and other persons who are involved in the enforcement of forced abortions by preventing such persons from entering or remaining in the United States. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment printed in part 3 of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 6. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on H.R. 2570, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2386) to implement the provisions of the Taiwan Relations Act concerning the stability and security of Taiwan and United States cooperation with Taiwan on the development and acquisition of defensive military articles. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill, modified by the amendments printed in part 4 of the report of the Committee on Rules, shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 7. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on H.R. 2386, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2605) to require the United States to oppose the making of concessional loans by international financial institutions to any entity in the People's Republic of China. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendments printed in part 5 of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee on Banking and Financial Services or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 8. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on H.R. 2605, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2647) to ensure that commercial activities of the People's Liberation Army of

China or any Communist Chinese military company in the United States are monitored and are subject to the authorities under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 9. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on H.R. 2647, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2232) to provide for increased international broadcasting activities in China. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 10. During consideration of any measures pursuant to this resolution, the list of questions on which the Chair may postpone proceedings under clause 5(b)(1) of rule I shall be considered to include (as though in one of the subdivisions (A) through (E)) both the question of adopting an amendment and the question of adopting a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a technical amendment to the resolution. After clearing a technical printing error with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], a member of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to House Resolution 302 placed at the desk be considered as adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding to me.

I am pleased to rise in support of House Resolution 302 providing for consideration of nine measures relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the rule (H. Res. 302) providing for consideration of nine measures relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the People's Republic of China.

Today the House addresses major aspects of the United States-China relationship in bringing these measures to the floor.

Many ask: Why are we taking up these measures? The answer is simple. We are taking up these measures because we made a

promise to the American people when the House unanimously adopted House Resolution 461 in June 1996.

That resolution, which was introduced by Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. COX, called for hearings and legislation by the cognizant House committees on issues of concern to the American people regarding the People's Republic of China. We're keeping our promise.

This legislative package is an effort to separate such issues as human rights, proliferation, and the advancement of democracy from our annual debate about China's trade status—the MFN issue.

The American people are deeply concerned about our relationship with China—all of our colleagues receive letters, phone calls, and other communications about it. We are responding to our constituents.

The Chinese are watching our actions closely. This is an opportune time to be open and to be frank with the new Chinese leadership that the American people and Congress are concerned about a number of important issues in our bilateral relationship.

Many of us in the Congress, and many of the American people, believe that the administration is soft-peddling issues which we as Americans feel strongly about—such as human rights, democratization, trade, Tibet, Taiwan, and our national security.

This legislation expresses the strong sentiment of the Congress and the American people on these issues and urges the administration to take appropriate action.

Seven of the nine bills fall within the sole or shared jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations. I am pleased with the work of the Rules Committee on these measures. Accordingly, I urge support for the rule so that we can proceed with consideration of these bills.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield half of our time, 30 minutes, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has granted one rule which provides for the consideration of nine bills relating to United States-China policy. Each of the nine bills will be considered separately. Each bill will receive one hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the committee of jurisdiction or their designees. In addition, the rule provides that one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, will be in order on each of the nine bills.

With that, I will proceed to describe briefly the procedure for each of those 9 bills.

The first bill the rules makes in order is H.R. 2358, the Political Freedom in China Act, under a modified, closed amendment process. In addition, the rule makes in order and waives points of order against the Gilman-Markey amendment specified in the Committee on Rules, report to be separately debatable for 30 minutes.

The rule then provides for the consideration of H.R. 2195, the Slave Labor Products Act, under a closed amend-

ment process. House Resolution 188, the fighting missile proliferation resolution, is to be considered under a modified, closed amendment process as well.

The rule then provides for the consideration of H.R. 967, the Free the Clergy Act, under a closed amendment process. The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2570, the Forced Abortion Condemnation Act.

Next, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2386, the Taiwan Missile Defense Act. The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2605, the China Subsidization Act. Next, the rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2647, the Denial of Normal Commercial Status to the Chinese People Liberation Army. The rule then provides for the consideration of H.R. 2232, the Radio Free Asia Act.

Finally, the rule provides that the Speaker may postpone proceedings on the question of adopting an amendment and the question of adopting a motion to recommit.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair, balanced rule. It makes in order four amendments by Democratic Members, two amendments by Republican Members, and six amendments which are bipartisan in nature.

Mr. Speaker, on the substance of the bill, let me just say that the day has finally arrived on this floor. Today we will consider a series of bills on China that I have just outlined that, together, represent a comprehensive approach to dealing with the myriad of problems presented by the criminal behavior of the Communist dictatorship in Beijing.

Year after year we in this Congress go through the routine process of attempting to deny but then granting most-favored-nation trading status to this regime, despite its endless list of crimes against humanity, crimes against innocent human beings. Then we forget about it for a year while China continues its human rights abuses, its grossly unfair trading practices, its huge military buildup, its sale of weapons and technology to rogue regimes like Iran, its religious persecutions of innocent, helpless human beings, and even worse, Mr. Speaker, selling ready-to-assemble factories to Middle East countries that produce chemical and biological weapons, including deadly nerve gas and other deadly germ warfare that could be used on American soldiers when they are called upon to defend another country, like Kuwait against Iraq. Members should read the newspaper and watch television and see what is happening with this man Hussein in Iraq.

The nine bipartisan bills we offer here today, and I emphasize "bipartisan," will help us break this vicious cycle. Each of them deals with a different aspect of our relationship with China, or addresses a particular transgression committed by this Communist dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I must at this point heap praise on the man I think most responsible for putting this package together and getting it to this floor this far, our Republican policy committee chairman, the gentleman from California, Mr. CHRIS COX. The gentleman from California [Mr. COX] and his staff have done diligent work, outstanding work over these past several months, as a matter of fact, several years, in overseeing this effort, and our hats certainly go off to him, and certainly I know it is appreciated by the oppressed people of China.

I would also like to thank the relevant committees which have reported out or discharged this legislation, including the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on National Security, and especially the committee which did the lions' share of work, the Committee on International Relations, under the able leadership of my good friend, the gentleman from New York, Mr. BEN GILMAN.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. NANCY PELOSI], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TONY HALL], and so many other Democrat Members on the other side of the aisle who have been unswerving in their support of a free China, and who also helped make this package a legislative reality.

Mr. Speaker, passage of these bills by this House is absolutely essential here today. Even if one were a supporter of MFN, one must admit that China's behavior is absolutely unacceptable, and this Congress cannot just stand idly by and do nothing about it, especially after the President of the United States fell all over himself last week rolling out the red carpet for this Chinese dictator, and offering him a bag of goodies in return for a couple of empty promises. We will be back here next year and 2 years from now, and I will recall those empty promises to Members, and Members will tell me that they were not fulfilled.

Let us look at the facts. On trade matters, hardly a day goes by when the economic and trade picture with China does not get worse. China's refusal to grant fair and open access to American goods has resulted in our trade deficit with that country skyrocketing to \$38 billion last year, and toward \$50 billion this year.

Do Members know how many American people were put out of work because of that? The people that make this shirt I am wearing here no longer have jobs. This has cost thousands of American jobs, and this Congress refuses to do anything about it, up until today.

While this package will not affect most-favored-nation trading status with China, the bill of the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] does attempt to address the problem of

the Chinese People's Liberation Army's huge commercial empire by requiring the executive branch to compile a list of People's Liberation Army companies, and authorizing the President to restrict trade with them under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act. Considering the crimes committed by the Chinese People's Liberation Army, as well as its clearly unfair trading practices. This is clearly the least we can do.

On the matter of human rights, hardly a day goes by without reading of yet another act of aggression, another act of duplicity, or another affront to humanity committed by these butchers of Beijing.

Consider this: The same people who conducted the massacre in Tiananmen Square and the inhumane oppression of Tibet, and if Members do not think they are being oppressed, go there and see firsthand what is happening to those poor people, they have been busily eradicating the last remnants of the democracy movement in China. It is gone, Mr. Speaker.

As we all know, according to this year's State Department human rights report, in 1996, China stepped up efforts to cut off expressions of protest, and had effectively silenced all opposition by intimidation, exile, or imprisonment. That is our State Department's report, Mr. Speaker. Read it.

I emphasize the words "stepped up," Mr. Speaker. Human rights in China are getting worse, not better. This package attempts to deal with this fact through a variety of means. H.R. 2358 that was introduced by the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] provides for \$2 million for additional diplomats dedicated to monitoring human rights to be posted throughout all of China, so we can see and we can have reports coming back to us.

Another bill introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] provides additional moneys for customs inspectors to monitor and enforce existing prohibitions on slave labor, of which Communist China is the world's premier user. And some of the people around here sing their praises. They still use slave labor, starving people to produce goods to sell in this country, like this shirt I am wearing, and 80 percent cheaper than we can make it in our country. And we sit here and do nothing about it?

The Free the Clergy Act, H.R. 967, of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEN GILMAN] denies visas to Chinese officials that are engaged in China's rampant religious persecution, and prohibits funding of travel to the United States for officials of Communist China's sham official churches. Do Members not know that that will send a message?

In a similar vein, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. TILLIE FOWLER] would deny visas to those officials involved in China's odious practice of forced abortions. They are bad enough,

abortions in themselves, but forced abortions?

And the gentleman from California [Mr. ED ROYCE] will increase funding for Radio Free Asia with the intent of achieving 24-hours-a-day broadcasting in China in multiple languages and in dialects, so that the people behind that Chinese iron curtain can see what is going on and can hear that there are people out there, that there is a beacon of hope for them.

In the field of national security, what we see is a relentless Chinese military buildup, ever more frequent exports of technology and weapons of mass destruction, and an increasingly belligerent Chinese foreign policy that even threatens to use those missiles on Los Angeles.

Where are all the Members from California? They ought to be terribly, terribly upset about that. Here is one back here.

While every other major country has reduced its military spending, Communist China has increased its military spending by double digits for a number of years now, and has already increased their military spending by 50 percent in just the last several years, while we in America and every other democracy in the world is cutting back. Why are they doing that? What have they got on their minds? What are they buying with all of that money? Soviet-made Sunburn missiles from Russia, that is what, and Soviet and Russian-made SU-27 Flankers, Kilo submarines, and a host of other equipment and technology that will allow China to, among other things, continue to intimidate the democratic society of Taiwan.

Meanwhile, China's irresponsible proliferation activities continue to go unabated, despite last week's paper promises. The fact is that China continues to export ballistic missile and nuclear technology to Pakistan, and missile, nuclear and chemical weapons technology to the avowed enemy of America.

Who says we are their enemy? Iran says we are their enemy. Yet China gives them the same nuclear technology that now we are telling them we are going to give to China. It is outrageous, Mr. Speaker.

This package also deals with these national security problems in several different ways. One bill calls for enforcement of the Gore-McCain Act, this is the law of the land, in light of China's C-802 missile shipments to Iran. That 1992 act calls for sanctions against countries which arm Iran, but the President and the Vice President have been ignoring the law, declining even to issue a waiver. Why? I wonder why.

H.R. 2386, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER], requires a report on the missile defense needs of Taiwan, and calls for sales of missile defense technology to Taiwan as soon as possible, so they can meet this threat.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I myself introduced an attempt to shut down the taxpayer-funded money flow to this rogue regime, which makes what we are doing here today necessary by requiring the United States to oppose all so-called soft money loans to China.

Here is this country. We are going to have people come on the floor today and they are going to praise this China's Government and say how successful they are, and look at their great economy. And we still give them money in foreign aid? We give our taxpayers' money to them?

Mr. Speaker, this world is upside down. It is high time for substantive and creative responses to the aforementioned affronts against humanity committed by this despotic dictatorship in China. That is what these nine bills are all about, and I would urge every Member to come over here, participate in this 10 hours of debate on the issues that I have just brought before Members. We need to do that not only for the people that are suffering under communism in China today, but we need to do it for the protection of the American people in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment to the resolution that was previously agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON:

The first sentence of section 2 is amended by striking "H.R. 2232" and inserting in lieu thereof "H.R. 2358".

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 302, is a compound rule that will allow consideration under a very closed amendment process. It allows nine separate bills or resolutions responding to human rights abuses in China.

As my colleague, the gentleman from New York, has described, this rule provides 1 hour of general debate for each bill, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee of original jurisdiction.

The rule permits only one floor amendment to be offered to one of the nine bills. No other floor amendments can be offered to that bill or any of the other nine bills in the China package. The rule self-executes 11 other amendments to some of the bills.

Mr. Speaker, I do share with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], an abomination of the human rights abuses in China. During my service in Congress, as others have done, I have devoted myself to improving human rights conditions in many of the forgotten places around the world. Therefore, I do appreciate the work of the gentleman, as well as the Committee on International Relations

chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for their continued focus on China's human rights abuses. China's brutal suppression of religious and political freedoms are well known. China has cracked down on political dissent, imprisoned and tortured people for their religious beliefs, and supported the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

China continues forced abortions for many women who do not follow the one-child-per-family policy, and the House of Representatives and the United States cannot remain silent on these human rights abuses.

The United States must do more than just talk about human rights abuses. We must take action that leads to improving the lives of the Chinese people. The bills before us today contain a number of creative approaches. They are the result of a great deal of effort by many House committees. It is an act of leadership and courage for us to consider them.

□ 1630

Unfortunately, I do not agree with the actions of the Committee on Rules in moving the China package forward under this process. I agree that there is a sense of urgency, and in fact I wish that the House had moved with stronger force to stop many human rights abuses that I and others have pointed out over the past two decades.

However, I believe that the speed of the process denies the opportunity for House Members to participate in the shaping of this legislation, and it increases the risk that the final product will not represent our best effort. For these reasons, I reluctantly oppose the rule.

Last night during consideration by the Committee on Rules, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], testified he had serious substantial concerns about this package of legislation. He also had serious concerns about the process. He pointed out that some of the bills had no hearings and there has been inadequate consultation with the administration and the intelligence community. The result, he warned, is likely to produce a flawed product that will not have the intent we seek and will not reflect well on Congress.

The Committee on Rules did self-execute amendments that will improve the package. I am thankful to the committee for making these changes and for including Democratic amendments.

However, this is the least preferable way to make the changes. It puts the Committee on Rules in the role of the decisionmaker, circumventing the normal committee process, and denies the opportunity for all House Members to vote on the self-executing amendments. With one exception, House Members are denied the opportunity to

offer their own amendments on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that speed and efficiency are necessary when important issues such as human rights come up. But under this rule, we are sacrificing too much of the rights of House Members and risking making too many mistakes to consider the China legislative package.

I would urge my colleagues to reject this rule and a very flawed process.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules. He is an outstanding supporter of human rights throughout this world. I wish I had more time than 3 minutes to yield to him. There will be ample other time during the 10 hours of general debate.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of this rule and to say that I am in agreement with many of the points that my friend from New York made. Probably the most important one to me is the fact that it is true over the years we constantly focus on the debate on whether or not we should renew most-favored-nation trading status with the People's Republic of China and then, while we have talked about many things, we unfortunately do not get on that road toward pursuing many of the very justifiable concerns that we have, and that is what this is all about today.

Before we had the vote on renewal of MFN earlier this year, the Speaker asked my colleague from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and me to put together a package which includes, in fact, an overwhelming majority of the items included in this legislation. We worked with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] and many other Members who got involved in this process, and in a bipartisan way we introduced H.R. 2095 with 40 cosponsors. And it is bipartisan; we have 14 Democrats who joined as cosponsors of that measure.

I am not going to stand here and be one of those that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] mentioned, who is going to praise the Chinese Government or, in fact, say that they are all very rich. I am a very strong critic of the actions of the Government of the People's Republic of China and those concerns which all of us share. I am not going to say that they are a rich country because they are not a rich country.

But I will say that if we look at the 5,000-year history of the People's Republic of China, clearly, market reforms have been the most powerful force for change, and our commercial relations with the People's Republic of China have been integral toward pursuing those reforms which have addressed many of the concerns that exist among the 1.3 billion people.

As I say, there are very deep and disturbing problems which do need to be addressed, and we are today taking a proactive position in trying to look at those.

I think that we need to shift the policy of debate simply on the issue of trade toward those ways that we can promote our American values, the Western values of human freedom, democracy, the rule of law, and respect for international norms. That is why I believe that when we look at the items included in H.R. 2095, we do many of those things that need to be addressed.

One of them I think is very important, and that is to increase funding for the National Endowment for Democracy. We have been key toward encouraging village elections throughout China. While some are critics of village elections, I think that anything we can do to encourage democratization, even if it is coming from the ground up where we now have, unlike during the Mao years, non-Communist candidates and we have in fact secret ballots, things that did not exist when village elections were taking place decades ago, those are positive. The International Republican Institute is on the front line toward helping literally hundreds of millions of people to participate there.

There are many other items that we have included in this measure, funding for Radio Free Asia and the Voice of America, and I believe that we have a very good package by and large. There are some things in this measure which concern me, but I do believe that those things that encourage greater political pluralism are things that we can support as a country.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I rise today to urge defeat of the rule. I do so with some reluctance, but I am concerned that we are about to embark on a debate that is not going to reflect well on the House of Representatives. We will set back U.S.-China relations and do harm to important American interests.

Some of the bills that we will consider are acceptable; some are not. On balance, I think bringing these bills forward now will do more harm than good in the U.S.-China relationship. A China debate by the Congress is entirely appropriate, if it is properly done. I have got substantive and procedural concerns about this package. I am concerned about the cumulative impact of this collection of bills.

The administration opposes almost all of these bills. I do not assume that the administration is right in all cases and the House wrong, but I am troubled that no process was followed to try to work out the differences on the bills.

Let me just say a word about the relationship with China. It is a terribly complex relationship. It is one of the most difficult foreign policy relationships in the world to manage, even in the best of times. The relationship often makes us uncomfortable. China as a country has many faults and does many things we do not like. The two countries have vastly different perspectives on a whole host of problems, as was obvious to all of us who heard President Jiang Zemin for even a few minutes last week.

But China is too big and too important to ignore. Notwithstanding our differences, we do have many common interests with China. The relationship has deteriorated very badly since 1989. We have just concluded an important summit meeting between the President of the United States and the President of China. I think that summit served real purposes and it put the U.S.-China dialogue back on track. We have got very tough problems ahead of us.

China has a long way to go before its behavior is acceptable to the international community. But looking over the last 25 years, China has evolved from a country ostracized by much of the world to a more acceptable and accepted member of the global community, although it is not there yet, by any measure.

I believe that China is making progress toward a market economy and a deeper integration into the world and has taken some steps toward a more open and accountable society. Even on the most difficult aspect of our relationship, human rights, personal freedom has expanded in recent years as a result of economic growth, and there has been some easing of governmental authority over everyday life.

I acknowledge that China has a very long way to go, and I agree with many of the protests against certain aspects of China policy. No one of us can guarantee the future. Direct conflict with China cannot be ruled out. We are at a moment of decision with China. Either China will decide to live by the rules that bind the rest of the international community or it will go off on its own, a threat to its neighbors and to vital U.S. interests. We are not going to control that decision, but we can influence it. It is in this context that the House takes up this package of legislation.

Cumulatively, these measures will be perceived as anti-China bills. What concerns me most about the package of bills and some of the rhetoric that will accompany them is that the House will be perceived as demonizing China and China may very well respond in kind.

I do not believe it serves American interests today to paint China, with all of its faults and with all of the concerns we have about its conduct, as a second evil empire. That is not the prescription for a productive relationship. While I support some of the measures before us today, as a whole I do not think these bills have been well considered.

We have not had a single hearing on several of the bills. Consultation with the administration has been limited and in some cases nonexistent. Administration positions and preferences have been ignored without even an effort to take the views of the executive branch into account. Members have been denied an opportunity to offer serious and substantive amendments. A flawed process is likely to produce a flawed result. In terms of substance, the deficiencies of this package are apparent.

Some of the bills, such as the one on cruise missiles to Iran, make very close judgments concerning the violation of existing laws without adequate intelligence briefings or consultations. Some of the measures before us are overly broad or vague. I might mention the two bills that deny U.S. visas to large numbers of unspecified Chinese. Some of the bills fail to take into account probable Chinese reactions and how these could affect American interests.

It would, for example, not serve U.S. interests if China were to bar admission into China for Billy Graham or other American religious leaders in retaliation for our denying visas to their religious officials. Some of the bills, such as the Taiwan ballistic missile development bill, could be counterproductive and produce a result very different from what we intend. Some of the bills, including H.R. 2570 on forced abortion and H.R. 967 on religious persecution, certainly worthy in their purpose, would create administrative nightmares for those responsible for their execution. In short, these are far-reaching bills with major substantive problems.

One question I ask is, what is the hurry? The Senate is not scheduled to take up these bills this year. We are about to adjourn. We have time to take a more deliberative approach and to produce a better product. I, of course, endorse the right and the responsibility of the Congress to express its views on important foreign policy issues, but our institutional right should be carefully and deliberately exercised.

On these delicate matters of foreign policy toward China, we should consult closely and work cooperatively with the President. It simply does not help American foreign policy for the Congress to charge off in one direction and the President in another. That is precisely what we are doing as we consider these bills.

A process should be followed that is unhurried and deliberate. We need to make every effort to debate China policy at a time and in a manner that does not frustrate the President's ability to conduct U.S. foreign policy. I do not think we have met those responsibilities.

My concern is that we are about to rush into actions that will not reflect favorably on the House of Representatives and could damage the Nation's interests. For these reasons, Mr. Speak-

er, I ask my colleagues to vote no on this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair advise us how much time remains on both sides?

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the very distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He came with me to this body 19 years ago and he is a very respected Member in Lincoln, NE.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding me the time.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific and as someone who has carefully followed events in the People's Republic of China for some time, this Member rises to address the legislative initiative orchestrated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

The legislative package that is before this body today contains a great many provisions that this gentleman fully supports. Some of the amendments made in order seem very appropriate. Others will be examined in debate. And some, perhaps, should be offered but cannot be offered. But I do believe a structured rule was essential.

The initiative on Radio Free Asia has been authored by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], an initiative also proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and this Member and recommended by our distinguished Speaker. It is a common sense proposal that would facilitate the flow of unfiltered information to tens of millions of Chinese.

Similarly, an initiative supporting ballistic missile defense for Taiwanese is unfortunately now merited, as is the proposal for additional State Department personnel to monitor human rights conditions. These are all worthwhile initiatives.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is the high prospect for a frenetic overtone to this unfolding debate. The underlying psychology of some of my colleagues seems to be to regain the initiative vis-a-vis the PRC. Mr. Speaker, the United States never lost the initiative.

The United States is the preeminent military, economic, and political power in the world today. Yes, it is true that China, together with much of the rest of Asia, has experienced major growth—but that is not a threat to us. This Member is a realist—we should not be creating enemies where none need exist.

Mr. Speaker, this Member fully shares the hope, desire, and commitment that human

rights and democracy will flourish within the PRC. By focusing on the details of very specific human rights abuses that one finds in today's headlines, it is easy to ignore the dramatic, undeniable progress that has occurred, and continues to occur. The China of today simply is not the China with which President Richard Nixon forged an opening in 1972. Rather, today's China is vibrant and rapidly changing. It is dynamic. In terms of personal prosperity, in terms of individual choice, in terms of access to outside sources of information and freedom of movement within the country, the Chinese undeniably enjoy increased freedom. Public dissent, however, is severely limited.

Moreover, just last year modest legal reforms were advanced in the area of criminal procedures which make it more likely that individuals will be considered innocent until proven guilty, will have the right to a lawyer at the time of detention, and will be able to challenge the arbitrary powers of the police. Although these reforms have far too many conditions or limitations that permit the government to suppress political dissent, they nonetheless represent progress toward rule of law in China.

All the village level, it would seem that a remarkable transformation has taken place without anyone noticing. Village elections, once the sole domain of local communist party functionaries, have in many but far from all cases, suddenly become contested events—with non-communists elected to some posts. This Member is not pretending that very serious, deeply rooted problems do not continue; they do. But the critics of the PRC should stop pretending that conditions for the average individual in China has not dramatically improved; of course, that varies greatly from region to region in China.

Mr. Speaker, this Member is absolutely convinced that democracy and broader respect for human rights inevitably will come to China. There is no way the Chinese leaders in Beijing can prevent the flow of information and ideas into their country. We can have at least some effect here, either positive or negatively.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, as President Clinton said, time is on our side. The objective that everyone will profess so loudly on this floor today will come in time if we do not blow it. Making China our adversary will not advance political nor religious rights, nor will it advance the security of Taiwan.

This Member would, therefore, simply urge, in the course of today's debate, that a measure of past-to-present analysis and a long-term perspective on what is actually in America's national interest should be applied to the debate about to unfold on the various resolutions in the China legislative package the rule makes in order today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, for his care and fairness in drafting it.

As a mother of four, I know that perfection is not an option, and I certainly agree with many speakers that this rule is not perfect. Nevertheless, I feel that it is timely and that it brings many important subjects to our attention. I would say to our colleagues who disagree with some of these resolutions and proposed amendments, vote against them. I may vote against some, too. But do not vote against this rule.

Let me make a couple of other points. Last week, as has been noted, the President of China was here. I thought his visit was very productive. I support the economic relationship with China and have voted twice against discontinuing most-favored-nation status for China. That does not mean, however, that I think that issues concerning human rights and proliferation are unimportant. I think they are very important. And this is our opportunity to address those, too, and to address those in a timely way before we adjourn.

On one subject, I would like to make a further point; and that is the language in this rule that automatically reports the text of House Concurrent Resolution 121 into House Resolution 188. Resolution 188 is offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and it concerns proliferation of missile technology from China to Iran. The addition to the other language is the full text of an amendment I have offered that has been reported unanimously by the Committee on House International Relations and has also been introduced in the other body, with many cosponsors, to direct the administration to impose sanctions on Russian firms that are engaging in missile proliferation to Iran. That is as urgent a threat as the Chinese proliferation. Combining the two makes the point more effectively. I look forward to a time later today when both will be passed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support of this rule and commend those involved for a very fair and complete process.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], one of the true defenders of human rights in this body. He is a member of our Committee on Rules.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, these nine bills that I strongly support bringing to the floor through this rule make a necessary statement, Mr. Speaker, a statement that I think, unfortunately, has not been made by the President of the United States. I certainly have not heard the President of the United States make it. And that is very clear, very simple, we want China to be free.

Yes, we recognize that China cannot be ignored, but we want freedom for the Chinese people. The reality of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is the international community generally is today engaged in a policy of massive capital and technology transfers to China in the context of what I would refer to as

the ugly face capitalism, the utilization of a system that permits extraordinary profits for major investors because of the lack, the total lack, of labor rights existing in that country.

Now, with that ugly face of capitalism and the increase of the gross domestic product that is occurring in China may come, and it always does with GDP, comes military power. I am convinced that unless the Chinese people are able to throw off the yoke of their oppressors, our children, Mr. Speaker, and their children will have to face very dangerous consequences, perhaps horrible consequences, the massive capital and technology transfer that China is benefiting from today.

So I believe that it is important that we make the statement and that we take the substantive steps that we will be taking with these bills. It is, obviously, very difficult for the people of China to free themselves when international capitalism is pouring billions of dollars into the coffers of the communist oppressors, billions that they use to maintain their oppressive apparatus. We can and I believe we must, and I believe the Congress is in fact saying with these bills, we do not accept the status quo, we want freedom for China.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this whole debate reminds me of a chapter of a book called "365 Days," where a doctor, Dr. Glasser, who treated patients during the Vietnam war, makes mention of the fact that our medics during the Vietnam conflict, when soldiers were so severely wounded that there was nothing that could be done for them, would often give them a sweettart and tell the dying soldier that it was for the pain; and somehow the soldiers, wanting to think they would get better, would actually feel better.

That is about what these bills do. It is like giving a dying soldier a sweettart. It does not save him. But maybe it is a psychological thing for the American people that somehow we will feel better about the fact that one of the world's most brutal dictatorial regimes has a \$40 billion trade surplus with our country and that they use that money to arm our votes.

I would hope that people would vote against this rule. Because I would like to offer an amendment to where, if we are really going to address the trade problems and the wrongs in the People's Republic of China, why do we not do something very simple, why do we not instruct our trade agencies and the people responsible for tariffs to, on a quarterly basis, look and see what the Chinese charge us for access to their markets and then adjust our tariffs to meet theirs. It is called fairness.

That bill is already drafted. I would like the opportunity to offer it as an amendment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I would like an open rule so that one of these bills could be amended to do just that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] that we have a protocol that we have followed that we cleared with the Democratic minority that we would only consider those bills that have been reported from the committees.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], as a matter of fact, has a bill dealing with the WTO that I am his major cosponsor of. We could not make that in order, Mr. GEPHARDT understands that, because the Committee on Ways and Means would not report it unfortunately.

I would like to cosponsor the gentleman's legislation if he introduces it, and I will do everything I can to help him move it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has just made my point. I think we ought to have an open rule. I do not think a handful of people in the Republican leadership or a handful of people in the Democratic leadership or just those people who are fortunate enough to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means should make this decision. I think everyone in this House should make the decision where we seek some basic level of fairness between what we charge the Chinese, which is almost nothing, to have access to our markets, which indeed in many instances are made by slave labor, and they are charging us anywhere from 30 to 40 percent for our goods and they have a 40-percent trade surplus with our country, which means they are the winner.

All I want is fairness and opportunity for Members of this body to decide whether or not we can have that level of fairness. For that reason, and especially since the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the distinguished Committee on Rules, would like the opportunity to vote for that bill, I would encourage every Member of this body to vote against the rule so that it would be open for debate so we have an opportunity to vote on just that.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], who is most responsible for bringing all of this legislation to the floor. He is the chairman of our policy committee for the Republican Party.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding me the time.

The recent visit of President Jiang Zemin has focused the attention of the American people on our relations with the People's Republic of China in a very constructive way. To the extent that the summit was meant to promote cordial relations between our two states and friendly dialog, it was a success. For President Jiang was warmly received, he was provided a 21-gun salute, a State dinner, a breakfast here on Capitol Hill with our congressional leadership, and he even had a chance to address the American people on the "McNeil-Lehrer News Hour."

Because we respect his position as the head of the Communist Party and as the President of the People's Republic of China, and because we recognize the importance of cordial relations with the world's most populous nation, we received him properly and openly. But there is more to our relationship than summitry and warm expressions of goodwill. We also must do the hard work of hammering out our distinctions on security issues, on the proliferation of technology for weapons of mass destruction, and on human rights, all of which are of fundamental importance, not just to the peoples of our countries, but to the people of the whole world.

For many years, United States policy toward the People's Republic of China has been mired in debate over MFN status, most favored nation trade status for the People's Republic of China. This is a stalemate that has frustrated all sides of the debate and hindered the development of a coherent China policy that addresses the diverse aspects of our relationship, many of which have little, if anything, to do with trade.

The attempt to refract every element of our policy toward the People's Republic of China through this single annual debate on trade policy has failed to do justice to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] rightly observes as a complex relationship. Because the choice presented in the MFN debate was binary, it was like a light switch on and off, we could not calibrate our responses to the nuance and change in the relationship. Even worse, the threat of MFN denial lost credibility with China's Government, providing the United States with little leverage on either trade or nontrade issues.

To move beyond this stalemate, the House adopted House Resolution 461 a year and a half ago, in June 1996. This resolution passed the House with bipartisan support. Let me quantify what I mean by "bipartisan support." The vote was 411-7. It is stated, the debate over Communist China's most favored nation trade status cannot bear the weight of the entire relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China. Instead, the bill enumerated in detail a series of concerns about the activities of the Communist Chinese military, about China's human rights record and about their economic and trade policy, and it charged the standing House commit-

tees of jurisdiction with holding hearings and reporting out appropriate legislation tailored to these separate concerns.

Six of our standing committees have now fulfilled that charge and sent to the floor nine separate pieces of legislation that contain discrete and measured responses to each of the serious issues in our bilateral relationship with the People's Republic of China.

□ 1700

Together these bills comprise a very positive policy for freedom that does not involve MFN but that does provide needed clarity to these important issues.

This effort remains thoroughly bipartisan. I want to recognize the hard work and the positive contributions of the Democrats as well as Republicans who have put this package together. It is the reason that I am addressing Members from the minority side of the aisle. I wanted to walk across to tangibly illustrate just how much we have worked together with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader; with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], as well as the authors of the legislation that we will be considering: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROSELEHTINEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] as well as scores of our colleagues.

Our policy for freedom supports a growing, positive relationship with a free China and it recognizes that the people of China are not the same as the regime in China.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude with a brief story from Chinese history, and a thought:

When the Ming Dynasty replaced the Mongols in the 14th century, China embarked on its own Age of Exploration, an era that antedated, and rivaled in every respect, the exploration and the discovery that was going on in Europe at the time. Chinese fleets scoured the Indian Ocean. They visited Indonesia, Ceylon, even the Red Sea and Africa, where they brought back giraffes to surprise and amaze people back home.

But this is where Chinese exploration ended. Who knows? With a little more wind, they might have rounded the Cape of Good Hope before the Portuguese. They might have reached Europe. They might even have discovered America.

Today, the irrepressible dreams of human freedom live on in China's diverse and tolerant peoples. But China's

explorers and discoverers are kept down by the worst of the 20th century's legacies, the last vestiges of totalitarianism, which also live on still in Communist China.

It is my hope that as we close the 20th century, America, whose unique mission in the world is to promote freedom, can provide the Chinese people with a little wind at their back so that this time they will round the corner, this time they really will be free, and so that our friendship will truly be strong and the world will be a much safer place.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for bringing this package together with the cooperation of both majority and minority Members and for the splendid debate that I know that we will have in the next 10 hours.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SOLOMON, for yielding time and I rise in strong support of this fair rule to expedite the consideration of these nine important initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the end of the session and we are taking steps to ensure full debate on these important topics without bogging the House down in days and days of speechmaking. This rule strikes a responsible balance. In my view it is well past time that Congress send a clear message challenging the human rights conduct, weapons proliferation, and hostile intelligence activity of the People's Republic of China. As chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have been closely following these and other issues to be discussed today. We have examined the activities of Chinese intelligence and military officers in the United States and we have studied the evidence of proliferation by China of weapons of mass destruction. We have also closely examined the brutal conduct of the Chinese Government toward many of its own citizens. The record is clear and tremendously unsettling—it is not one of freedom, but one of repression. China, whether we like it or not, is one of the single greatest national security concerns facing us today.

Today we are finally taking concrete action, some basic steps to demonstrate our real concern about the intentions and activities of the Chinese regime. Through these nine bills we will encourage enforcement of the 1992 Iran-Iraq Nonproliferation Act. We will monitor the access of and deny United States subsidies and United States visas to Chinese intelligence officers and others who work against America and its interests. We will promote human rights in China and punish those who persecute, who perform abortions, and who exploit forced labor. In short, we will define a congressional agenda toward China, one of freedom and tolerance.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the efforts of all Members who have helped bring these important bills to the floor. I especially commend my

friend from California, Mr. COX, for his steady leadership in this crucial national security area. I intend to maintain a clear and high priority focus on China in my capacity as chairman of HPSCI.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CALVERT]. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 184, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

YEAS—237

Abercrombie	Ehrlich	Kind (WI)
Aderholt	Emerson	King (NY)
Archer	English	Kingston
Armey	Ensign	Klug
Bachus	Eshoo	Knollenberg
Baker	Everett	Kolbe
Ballenger	Ewing	LaHood
Barr	Fawell	Largent
Barrett (NE)	Foley	Latham
Bartlett	Forbes	LaTourette
Barton	Fossella	Lazio
Bass	Fowler	Leach
Bateman	Fox	Lewis (CA)
Bereuter	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Bilbray	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Bilirakis	Furse	Livingston
Biley	Galleghy	LoBiondo
Blunt	Ganske	Lucas
Boehlert	Gekas	Manzullo
Boehner	Gibbons	McCarthy (NY)
Bonilla	Gilchrest	McCollum
Bono	Gillmor	McCrery
Brady	Gilman	McDade
Bryant	Goode	McHugh
Bunning	Goodlatte	McInnis
Burr	Goodling	McIntosh
Burton	Goss	McKeon
Buyer	Graham	Metcalf
Callahan	Granger	Mica
Calvert	Greenwood	Miller (FL)
Camp	Gutknecht	Moran (KS)
Campbell	Hall (TX)	Moran (VA)
Canady	Hansen	Myrick
Cannon	Harman	Nethercutt
Castle	Hastert	Neumann
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Ney
Chambliss	Hayworth	Northup
Chenoweth	Hefley	Norwood
Christensen	Herger	Nussle
Coble	Hill	Ortiz
Coburn	Hilleary	Oxley
Collins	Hobson	Packard
Combest	Hoekstra	Pappas
Cook	Horn	Parker
Cooksey	Hostettler	Paul
Cox	Houghton	Paxon
Crane	Hulshof	Pease
Crapo	Hunter	Pelosi
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Peterson (PA)
Davis (VA)	Hyde	Pickering
Deal	Inglis	Pitts
DeLay	Istook	Pombo
Deutscher	Jenkins	Porter
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (CT)	Portman
Dickey	Johnson (WI)	Pryce (OH)
Doolittle	Johnson, Sam	Quinn
Dreier	Jones	Radanovich
Duncan	Kasich	Ramstad
Dunn	Kelly	Redmond
Ehlers	Kim	Regula

Riggs  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roukema  
Royce  
Ryun  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Schaffer, Bob  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays

Shimkus  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith, Linda  
Snowbarger  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stabenow  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sununu  
Talent  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)

Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Traficant  
Upton  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NAYS—184

Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Obey
Allen	Hamilton	Olver
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Baessler	Hefner	Pallone
Baldacci	Hilliard	Pascarella
Barcia	Hinchey	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Hinojosa	Payne
Becerra	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Bentsen	Hoolley	Pickett
Berman	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Poshard
Bishop	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Blagojevich	(TX)	Rahall
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Rangel
Bonior	John	Reyes
Borski	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Boswell	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Boucher	Kaptur	Roemer
Boyd	Kennedy (MA)	Rothman
Brown (CA)	Kennedy (RI)	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kennelly	Rush
Cardin	Kildee	Sabo
Carson	Kilpatrick	Sanchez
Clay	Klecicka	Sanders
Clayton	Klink	Sandlin
Clement	Kucinich	Sawyer
Clyburn	LaFalce	Scott
Condit	Lampson	Serrano
Costello	Lantos	Sherman
Coyne	Levin	Sisisky
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Cummings	Lipinski	Skelton
Danner	Lofgren	Slaughter
Davis (FL)	Lowey	Smith, Adam
Davis (IL)	Luther	Snyder
DeFazio	Maloney (CT)	Spratt
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Delahunt	Manton	Stenholm
DeLauro	Markey	Stokes
Dellums	Martinez	Strickland
Dicks	Mascara	Stupak
Dingell	Matsui	Tanner
Dixon	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Doggett	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Dooley	McGovern	Thompson
Doyle	McHale	Thurman
Edwards	McIntyre	Tierney
Engel	McNulty	Torres
Etheridge	Meehan	Towns
Evans	Meek	Turner
Farr	Menendez	Velazquez
Fattah	Millender	Vento
Fazio	McDonald	Visclosky
Filner	Miller (CA)	Waters
Ford	Minge	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Mink	Waxman
Frost	Moakley	Wexler
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Weygand
Gephardt	Murtha	Wise
Gordon	Nadler	Woolsey
Green	Neal	Wynn
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Yates

NOT VOTING—12

Brown (FL)	Foglietta	Petri
Conyers	Gonzalez	Riley
Cubin	McKinney	Schiff
Flake	Morella	Schumer

□ 1729

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Riley for, with Ms. McKinney against.

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, CUMMINGS, REYES, and ADAM

SMITH of Washington changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER MEMBER AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 2009

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 2009, a bill initially introduced by former Representative Capps of California, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### POLITICAL FREEDOM IN CHINA ACT OF 1997

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 302, and as the designee of the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, I call up the bill (H.R. 2358) to provide for improved monitoring of human rights violations in the People's Republic of China, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 2358 is as follows:

H.R. 2358

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Political Freedom in China Act of 1997".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Congress concurs in the following conclusions of the United States Department on human rights in the People's Republic of China in 1996:

(A) The People's Republic of China is "an authoritarian state" in which "citizens lack the freedom to peacefully express opposition to the party-led political system and the right to change their national leaders or form of government".

(B) The Government of the People's Republic of China has "continued to commit widespread and well documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms, stemming from the authorities' intolerance of dissent, fear of unrest, and the absence or inadequacy of laws protecting basic freedoms".

(C) "[a]buses include torture and mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, and arbitrary and incommunicado detention".

(D) "[p]rison conditions remained harsh [and] [t]he Government continued severe restrictions on freedom of speech, the press, assembly, association, religion, privacy, and worker rights".

(E) "[a]lthough the Government denies that it holds political prisoners, the number of persons detained or serving sentences for

'counterrevolutionary crimes' or 'crimes against the state' and for peaceful political or religious activities are believed to number in the thousands".

(F) "[n]on-approved religious groups, including Protestant and Catholic groups . . . experienced intensified repression".

(G) "[s]erious human rights abuses persist in minority areas, including Tibet, Xinjiang, and Inner Mongolia[, and] [c]ontrols on religion and other fundamental freedoms in these areas have also intensified".

(H) "[o]verall in 1996, the authorities stepped up efforts to cut off expressions of protest or criticism. All public dissent against the party and government was effectively silenced by intimidation, exile, the imposition of prison terms, administrative detention, or house arrest. No residents were known to be active at year's end."

(2) In addition to the State Department, credible independent human rights organizations have documented an increase in repression in China during 1996, and effective destruction of the dissident movement through the arrest and sentencing of the few remaining pro-democracy and human rights activists not already in prison or exile.

(3) Among those were Wang Dan, a student leader of the 1989 pro-democracy protests, sentenced on October 30, 1996, to 11 years in prison on charges of conspiring to subvert the Government; Li Hai, sentenced to 9 years in prison on December 18, 1996, for gathering information on the victims of the 1989 crackdown, which according to the court's verdict constituted "state secrets"; and Liu Nianchun, an independent labor organizer, sentenced to 3 years of "re-education through labor" on July 4, 1996, due to his activities in connection with a petition campaign calling for human rights reforms.

(4) Many political prisoners are suffering from poor conditions and ill-treatment leading to serious medical and health problems, including—

(A) Wei Jingsheng, sentenced to 14 years in prison on December 13, 1996, for conspiring to subvert the government and for "communication with hostile foreign organizations and individuals, amassing funds in preparation for overthrowing the government and publishing anti-government articles abroad," is currently held in Jile No. 1 Prison (formerly the Nanpu New Life Salt Farm) in Hebei province, where he reportedly suffers from severe high blood pressure and a heart condition, worsened by poor conditions of confinement;

(B) Gao Yu, a journalist sentenced to 6 years in prison on November 1994 and honored by UNESCO in May 1997, has a heart condition; and

(C) Chen Longde, a leading human rights advocate now serving a 3-year reeducation through labor sentence imposed without trial in August 1995, has reportedly been subject to repeated beatings and electric shocks at a labor camp for refusing to confess his guilt.

(5) In 1997, only 1 official in the United States Embassy in Beijing is assigned to human monitoring human rights in the People's Republic of China, and no officials are assigned to monitor human rights in United States consulates in the People's Republic of China.

#### SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AT DIPLOMATIC POSTS TO MONITOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

There are authorized to be appropriated to support personnel to monitor political repression in the People's Republic of China in the United States Embassy in Beijing, as well as the American consulates in Guangzhou, Shanghai, Shenyang, Chengdu,

and Hong Kong, \$2,200,000 for fiscal years 1998 and \$2,200,000 for fiscal year 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the amendments printed in the bill and the amendments printed in part 1-A of House Report 105-336 are adopted.

The text of H.R. 2358, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 302, is as follows:

H.R. 2358

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Political Freedom in China Act of 1997".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Congress concurs in the following conclusions of the United States State Department on human rights in the People's Republic of China in 1996:

(A) The People's Republic of China is "an authoritarian state" in which "citizens lack the freedom to peacefully express opposition to the party-led political system and the right to change their national leaders or form of government".

(B) The Government of the People's Republic of China has "continued to commit widespread and well documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms, stemming from the authorities' intolerance of dissent, fear of unrest, and the absence or inadequacy of laws protecting basic freedoms".

(C) "[a]buses include torture and mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, and arbitrary and incommunicado detention".

(D) "[p]rison conditions remained harsh [and] [t]he Government continued severe restrictions on freedom of speech, the press, assembly, association, religion, privacy, and worker rights".

(E) "[a]lthough the Government denies that it holds political prisoners, the number of persons detained or serving sentences for 'counterrevolutionary crimes' or 'crimes against the state', or for peaceful political or religious activities are believed to number in the thousands".

(F) "[n]onapproved religious groups, including Protestant and Catholic groups . . . experienced intensified repression".

(G) "[s]erious human rights abuses persist in minority areas, including Tibet, Xinjiang, and Inner Mongolia[, and] [c]ontrols on religion and on other fundamental freedoms in these areas have also intensified".

(H) "[o]verall in 1996, the authorities stepped up efforts to cut off expressions of protest or criticism. All public dissent against the party and government was effectively silenced by intimidation, exile, the imposition of prison terms, administrative detention, or house arrest. No dissidents were known to be active at year's end."

(2) In addition to the State Department, credible independent human rights organizations have documented an increase in repression in China during 1995, and effective destruction of the dissident movement through the arrest and sentencing of the few remaining pro-democracy and human rights activists not already in prison or exile.

(3) Among those were Wang Dan, a student leader of the 1989 pro-democracy protests, sentenced on October 30, 1996, to 11 years in prison on charges of conspiring to subvert the Government; Li Hai, sentenced to 9 years in prison on December 18, 1996, for gathering information on the victims of the 1989 crackdown, which according to the court's verdict constituted "state secrets"; Liu Nianchun,